

97-84062-27

U.S. Federal Council of
Citizenship Training

Federal Council of
Citizenship Training

Washington

1924

97-84062-27
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308	
Z	U. S. Federal council of citizenship training.
Box 180	Federal council of citizenship training. Washing- ton, Govt. print. off., 1924.
	2 p. l., 16 p. fld. chart. 23cm.
	At head of title: Department of the interior. Bureau of education.
	1. U. S. Federal council of citizenship training.
	_____ Copy 2. E 24-572
	Library, U. S. Bur. of Education JK1759.U66
	ONLY ED.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (11A) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 4-2-97

INITIALS: B

TRACKING # : MSH 23274

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

308

Z

Box 180

Federal Council
of
Citizenship Training

Dept. of the Interior
Bureau of Education

OCT 7 1924

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF EDUCATION

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF
CITIZENSHIP TRAINING



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1924

CITIZENSHIP TRAINING FEDERAL COUNCIL ON

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
5 CENTS PER SINGLE COPY
\$5.00 PER HUNDRED COPIES

Rev June 1925

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Origin	1
II. Activities	6
III. Principles of coordination	8
IV. Suggestions	10
Appendix—	
A. States cooperating	11
B. Chart of Federal activities	17

III

MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CITIZENSHIP TRAINING

Department of the Interior:
J. J. Tigert, *Chairman*.
George F. Zook.
Department of Agriculture:
A. C. True, *Vice Chairman*.
I. W. Hill.
War Department:
R. E. Beebe.
C. R. Mann, *Secretary*.
Department of State:
Arthur Bliss Lane.
J. P. Doughten.
Treasury Department:
B. L. Lloyd.
W. F. Draper.
Department of Justice:
George E. Strong.
Post Office Department:
Louis Brehm.
C. A. Rausch.

IV

Navy Department:
Arthur P. Fairchild.
L. R. Alderman.
Department of Commerce:
H. H. Kelley.
T. R. Taylor.
Department of Labor:
Raymond F. Crist.
O. T. Moore.
Federal Board for Vocational Education:
J. C. Wright.
Frank Cushman.
United States Veterans' Bureau:
L. W. Bartlett.
F. U. Quillin.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CITIZENSHIP TRAINING

I. ORIGIN

The Federal Council of Citizenship Training was created by Executive order of the President, January 12, 1923. This order was not a sudden inspiration. It was the logical conclusion of a long series of events that followed in the wake of the World War.

These antecedent events were many and their interrelations are too complex for discussion here. Fortunately the details of the more significant factors in the general development are recorded and summarized in a few outstanding reports.

One of these is the compilation from Army records of statistics concerning the defects found in drafted men. This was published by the War Department in 1920. The general summary of this report has been given wide publicity. Everyone knows that nearly half of the men examined were physically defective to an extent that rendered them unfit for unlimited military service.

Another significant report is that of the Committee on Classification of Personnel. It was surprising to most Americans to learn that only 1 out of every 6 men who claimed trade skill was really able to qualify as an expert, and only 1 out of 3 possessed the skill of journeyman. Although the Army gave a technical training to some million and a quarter men to meet its need for technical skill, yet at the close of the war there were over 500,000 unfilled requisitions for technical specialists needed to complete the Army organization.

Another of these basic documents of progress is the Report on Waste and Industry issued in 1921 by a committee of the Federated American Engineering Societies. This report makes vigorous recommendations as to how prodigal wastes in industry may be saved by better organization and standardization of materials, processes, and products. It is even more significant because, by its forceful presentation of the losses due to physical defects, sickness, and other human weaknesses, it has stimulated further action and study of the development, conservation, and use of man power in all phases of human activity.

A further significant element in this general movement was the Conference on Unemployment held in Washington in the fall of 1921

under the leadership of the Secretary of Commerce. The report of this conference states that "In calling this conference the President has hoped to mobilize the sense of service in our people to the solution of a problem that is of primary necessity to the public welfare." In harmony with this purpose the conference made perfectly clear the fact that unemployment is a problem that can not be dealt with successfully in a centralized way by the Federal Government, but that it is one which each community must solve on its own initiative and with its own energy and resources. This dynamic suggestion from this conference got immediate results. The great majority of communities went to work with a will to remove unemployment, with the result that there were relatively few who were willing to work who could not find work during the succeeding winter.

Another constructive factor in this conference was its plan of organization. Those in attendance were divided into small committees, each of which was given a specific problem and a considerable amount of reliable facts and statistics relating thereto. Each of these subcommittees was given a specified time in which to discuss their problem and formulate definite recommendations. The result was a series of recommendations that greatly clarified the problem of unemployment and have resulted in unmeasured benefit to all concerned.

Fully impressed by the foregoing events, the American Council on Education called in informal conference some fifteen well-known educators to consider the feasibility of organizing a conference similar to that on unemployment to consider the more general problem of efficient development and use of man power. There resulted from this conference a recommendation that the President be asked to call such a national conference on man power. A possible agenda was drawn up, plans were formulated, and the suggestion was passed on to the President in the spring of 1922. The time did not, however, seem to him opportune for such a far-reaching undertaking.

In the fall of 1922 one phase of this suggestion was taken up by the War Department. A Conference on the Training of Youth for Citizenship and National Defense was called by the Secretary of War in November. There were in attendance about 125 civilian educators who had had wide experience in training young men. Following the example of the Conference on Unemployment, the group was divided into three major working committees, one to consider the problem of citizenship, one to study the relations between the War Department and the colleges with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and one to consider the problems connected with the citizens' military training camps.

In opening this conference the Secretary of War said: "National strength is the underlying topic of this conference. We are assem-

bled to consider the mental, moral, and physical fitness of our people and to plan how we can all work together more intelligently and effectively to obtain our common purpose—better citizenship."

He then pointed out that because of the War Department's responsibility for administering the Military Establishment during the war, the Army had accumulated an enormous amount of very definite information concerning the physical fitness, the technical skill, the general intelligence, and the attitude toward national life of a large cross section of our people. This important information had been gathered and organized by a large number of our best educators and psychologists who were temporarily in the military service. It was the desire of the War Department to render this material available to civilian educational agencies, on whom now rests the responsibility for training young Americans, and to give these agencies all the aid of which it is capable in making constructive use of these data for the production of more vigorous American manhood.

The Secretary of War also made clear that in doing this the War Department finds itself in a peculiar dilemma. While the Federal Government is responsible for the administration of national defense—for the raising and maintenance of armies and a navy—the physical, moral, and mental education of our youth is reserved to the States and to the people. The Federal Government thus finds itself with a large responsibility, but with no jurisdiction over the fundamental factor—manhood—upon which success ultimately depends. National defense is therefore not a remote activity which gives employment to a relatively small number of professional soldiers. It is of immediate and vital concern to all the citizens all the time. The problem of the conference therefore was to determine in the light of the facts presented what can be done to bring home to every individual citizen his personal responsibility for better manhood and better citizenship in so vital a way that results will follow.

After this general introduction, the conference divided into three special committees, one on citizenship training, one on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and one on the citizens' military training camps. After a day and a half of careful consideration of their respective problems, the committees reported their recommendations back to the main conference. The significant findings with regard to citizenship training are as follows.

1. Training for citizenship is one of the most pressing problems before the Nation to-day.

2. The underlying cause for particular attention to this problem in America lies in the facts that our population is so heterogeneous and that the immigration during the past 30 years has been of a nature that does not assimilate so rapidly as that which came prior to 1890. For this reason, our problem

is both unique and more difficult than that of any other nation in the world. There are no precedents. We must solve it for ourselves.

3. Recognizing the value of the data collected and classified by the War Department in the recent military and the naval service of our country, and conscious of the duty resting upon every citizen to interest himself in the well-being and unity of the Nation, we have been glad to come to Washington at the request of the Secretary of War to make use of such data and to give our judgment on the larger problems, far exceeding any purely military situation, which such data and our own contributions present.

4. It is our firm conviction that we should seek first and directly to create a citizenship of youth and of adult men and women mentally, morally, and physically fit to meet the duties of citizenship which are even greater in peace than in war; that the right solution of the problem of preparedness and national defense is a people mentally alert, morally upright, physically fit, that only from a just solution of the educational, industrial, and social questions of the day will we grow to be one united nation, sound in heart, and head, and hand.

In addition to the foregoing statement of the attitude toward the problem, the conference made three specific recommendations to the Secretary of War as to further action to secure better training for citizenship. These were:

1. *With regard to physical training.*—One of the most effective means of obtaining better physique consists in formulating sound and generally applicable specifications and standards of physical fitness and in using these as a guide in providing practical and stimulating incentives to youth to participate in activities that both make for physical fitness and provide means for measuring achievement. As a practical step for securing such standards and bringing them into use, it was recommended that the National Amateur Athletic Federation of America be invited by the Secretary of War to undertake to define suitable specifications and standards for physical fitness and to promote their use.

In response to this recommendation the National Amateur Athletic Federation was invited to undertake this task. The invitation was accepted and work was begun at once toward the formulation of objective standards of physical fitness. These were published by the federation in the form of standard tables of physical proficiency in the spring in 1923. These tables are being tested by various organizations interested in physical development and are being corrected and improved in the light of experience. (For further information apply to the Amateur Athletic Federation, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City.)

2. *With regard to technical training.*—Since it is a matter of the greatest importance both to the solution of present industrial and economic problems and to national defense that the separate efforts of the various agencies now engaged in developing standard methods of analyzing and classifying occupational services be coordinated, it was recommended that, as the next step in the development of this work, the Secretary of War invite the National Research Council to call a conference of representative men now working on this problem

for the purpose of devising ways and means of coordinating their work and forming a permanent organization to further it. As a result of this recommendation, the Research Council was invited to call this conference, which was assembled in January, 1923.

After a full discussion of the problem, it was agreed to organize a national board on personnel classification, consisting of one delegate from each of the seven major groups immediately concerned with this problem, namely, education, labor, Federal Government, State and municipal government, engineering, industrial management, and research. This board has been organized and is working steadily toward the creation of a standard terminology for occupational workers and a well-defined procedure in dealing with this problem.

3. *With regard to citizenship training.*—On the basis of the facts and figures submitted to the conference and the situation that was revealed by the reports of the various agencies attending, it was the sense of the meeting that some method should be employed for defining major objectives and effective procedures in citizenship training for the common use of all concerned. As a means of securing this result it was recommended that there be created within the executive departments of the Federal Government the Federal Council of Citizenship Training, composed of those men in Federal service who are actively engaged in administering the Federal offices that deal with particular phases of this problem.

This recommendation of the conference was presented by the Secretary of War to all the executive heads of all the Government departments and their cooperation was sought in establishing such a council. The proposal was unanimously approved, with the result that on February 12 the President issued the following Executive order:

There is hereby created the Federal Council of Citizenship Training. The membership of this council shall consist of one representative and one alternate appointed as designated below from each of the following Federal offices:

1. The Department of the Interior (Bureau of Education), appointed by the Secretary of Interior.
2. The War Department (Operations and Training Division, General Staff), appointed by the Secretary of War.
3. The Navy Department (Educational Section, Bureau of Navigation), appointed by the Secretary of Navy.
4. The Treasury Department (Public Health Service), appointed by the Secretary of Treasury.
5. The Post Office Department (Welfare Division), appointed by the Postmaster General.
6. The Department of Agriculture (States Relations Service), appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.
7. The Department of Labor (Naturalization Bureau), appointed by the Secretary of Labor.
8. The Federal Board for Vocational Education, appointed by the chairman of the board.
9. The United States Veterans' Bureau (Rehabilitation Division), appointed by the director of the bureau.

10. The Department of State, appointed by the Secretary of State.
 11. The Department of Justice, appointed by the Attorney General.
 12. The Department of Commerce, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.
- An alternate may attend the meetings of the council and shall attend whenever the member from his office is unable to be present.

The first meeting of the council will be held on Friday, January 26, 1923, at 2 p. m. in room 241, State, War, and Navy Building. Subsequent meetings shall be held not less than once a month at times and places designated by the council.

The council shall elect its own officers and determine its own procedure. It shall not report as a body to any one Federal office; but each member shall report its findings and recommendations to his own department head through usual channels for consideration and action.

The duties of the council are to make constructive suggestions as to how the Federal offices may cooperate to secure more effective citizenship training, both in their own work and in cooperation with all other public and private agencies throughout the country. The facilities of all Federal offices shall be available as far as is practicable to further the work of the council.

WARREN G. HARDING.

II. ACTIVITIES

The first meeting of the Federal Council of Citizenship Training was held on January 26, 1923. The Executive order creating the council was read and its instructions carefully considered. A subcommittee was appointed to draw up a plan of organization for the council, and it was agreed that at the next meeting each member should submit a statement describing the activities of his office in the matter of citizenship training and defining his conception of the objectives of citizenship training.

The statements describing the activities of the various offices were studied and discussed for several months. The results of the study were finally tabulated in the chart appended to this report. In this chart the population is classified into five major groups, and the relation between the various Government departments and each of these groups is indicated. This chart has been officially approved by each department as correctly representing the activities of that department in this matter. (Compare Appendix B.)

The compilation of the definitions of the objectives of citizenship training submitted by the several departments proved a much more difficult task. The statements were so general and proved on analysis to be capable of such varied interpretation that they afforded little practical guidance in determining what should be done to promote better citizenship. Gradually it became evident that better results could be secured by defining the objectives of citizenship training in terms of standards of achievement in the practical affairs of community life instead of in terms of general ideals. The adoption of the plan for a community score card quickly followed.

The score card idea is not new. It has been used from time immemorial in all games and contests. It was applied to measurement of the relative excellence of community organization and life several

years ago in West Virginia by the extension department of the University of West Virginia. There, some 125 communities have scored themselves on a card prepared by the university and much progress has been made toward improving communities because of the competition for good scores generated by the process. This experience was the origin of the Federal Council's plan to issue a score card.

The score card presents a wide variety of questions that can be answered quantitatively by collection of facts concerning schools, public health, industrial training, voting, and social organization. As an example of the type of questions used consider the following:

What per cent of the legally qualified voters vote in the final election?

If 90 to 100 per cent, score 15.

If 80 to 90 per cent, score 12, etc.

Other questions are: Are the issues of elections discussed by pupils in the schools? Has an analysis been made by occupations of the electorate in your community showing which groups of citizens do not vote? What per cent of children of legal school age attend school daily? What is the death rate? What is the infant mortality? What library facilities are there? What provision for playgrounds and recreation, etc.?

The community score card was issued in tentative form in June, 1923, and was distributed to a number of individuals known to be interested in this project and in a position to make a tentative try-out of the scores set. This tryout was made in the summer of 1923, and the score card was revised in the light of many practical suggestions offered. This revised score card was issued as a bulletin of the Bureau of Education in December, 1923. (Copies may be secured from the secretary of the council, 345 State, War, and Navy Building, Washington, D. C.)

The problem of how best to bring the score card to the attention of the communities and encourage them to use it was discussed at great length. It is clear that the only way to secure a successful scoring of a community is by cooperation of a number of citizens voluntarily organized for that purpose. It is equally clear that an activity of this sort looking toward better training for citizenship is a State function and not one for the Federal Government. It was therefore agreed that the cooperation of the States should be sought in bringing the score card into practical use.

To this end in October, 1923, a letter was addressed by the President to the governor of each State, asking his cooperation and inviting him to appoint in his State an individual or a committee which would cooperate with the Federal Council in this matter. The reactions of the several States to this invitation from the President have been very different. A summary of the replies that have been received to date is printed in Appendix A.

Negotiations are continuing and steady progress is being made in developing a public recognition of the importance of the score card

idea as a means of defining the objectives of good citizenship and stimulating action toward their realization.

Neither the West Virginia score card nor the Federal Council's score card presents a complete and perfect program for rating communities with regard to good citizenship. Even if such a perfect score card existed, little benefit would result from a comparison on a national scale of the relative merits of communities. The vital point is that every community develop the habits both of gathering for itself the significant facts about its own community life and of cooperating locally to improve itself in ways indicated by those facts. For these purposes a locally designed score card may be much more effective in stimulating intercommunity competition.

In Wisconsin an intercommunity contest has been inaugurated and a prize of \$1,000 offered to the community judged to be the best in the State. A committee on standards has been appointed to determine the factors and principles of rating to be used. It is hoped that other States will follow the example of West Virginia and Wisconsin in developing State community score cards and better cities competitions as the most dynamic method of improving citizenship and making communities better places in which to live.

III. PRINCIPLES OF COORDINATION

One of the major duties of the Federal Council as defined by the Executive order is to make constructive suggestions as to how the Federal offices may cooperate to secure more effective citizenship training. The achievement of this objective was made possible by the provision in the order that the council "shall not report as a body to any one Federal office; but each member shall report its findings and recommendations to his own department head through usual channels for consideration and action."

Because of this provision the council has no administrative or executive function and therefore is not in a position to attempt any administrative or executive coordination of Federal activities. The wisdom of this provision is obvious when one considers how futile it would be for one executive office, like the Bureau of Education, to attempt to administer citizenship training in the Army, Federal Board for Vocational Education, Veterans' Bureau, Naturalization Bureau, or the Cooperative Extension Service for the Department of Agriculture. Because of the recognized futility of such administrative coordination it has been frequently considered that no coordination of educational effort among the various Federal offices is possible. By the procedure adopted by the Federal Council a large amount of coordination has already been secured.

From the foregoing pages it is clear that this procedure has consisted in two main steps, namely, first, in making a chart showing what the activities of the several departments are and what administrative machinery is used in making the work effective. This chart

and the illuminating discussions that accompanied its production have made the Federal offices acquainted with one another's work in a way that they have never before. This mere knowledge of one another's activities and purposes has of itself produced a considerable amount of coordination in point of view, objectives, and methods of procedure.

The second step, the production of the score card, has also resulted in coordination of thought and action. It required careful analysis of community activities and decisions as to which facts of community life are most significant as concrete revelations of good citizenship in action. This process of analysis, discussion, and selection of significant facts in the situation has emphasized the necessity for a dynamic definition of the ideals of citizenship as a basis for appraising the relative value of different activities and as a guide for improvement.

The Federal Council has searched long and diligently for such a dynamic definition of the ideals of good citizenship. It has tried many of the definitions proposed, and has been unable to find anything that compares in completeness and practical utility as a guide in this work with the Preamble to the Constitution:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

As its third suggestion as to procedure for development of better citizenship, the Federal Council therefore recommends the use of the Preamble to the Constitution as a definition of the ideals for the achievement of which every citizen, every community, every state, and the Nation as a whole, may well strive. A trial of it for this purpose shows that it does define criteria which make it possible to determine whether a community practice or a type of instruction helps or hinders the realization of the ideals it expresses. Common agreement on such a great common purpose of community life also furnishes the emotional drive required to achieve significant results.

Our national experience during the war illustrated how a great common purpose released national energy, inspired forgetfulness of personal interests for the sake of a common cause, caused men to sacrifice individual ambition and work without limit for the achievement of a common objective. We are the same people that we were during the war. We are, however, no longer working together with fervor for a common purpose with the eagerness for national service that marked our war-time activities. The reason for this is not that we have changed as a people, nor because we have lost our national spirit, but rather because we are not aware of a clearly defined single objective which inspires all to coordinated action and team play for the common welfare. It is believed that such unity of purpose can be brought about if the people really understand the meaning of our national ideals as defined in the Preamble to the Constitution.

IV. SUGGESTIONS

As in the Federal Government, so in every community there are numerous agencies, each working in its own way for better citizenship and better community life. During the past five years the need for coordination of effort among these varied activities has been growing more and more apparent. Many of these community organizations are local chapters of national organizations, of which there are at least 2,000 covering as many special phases of industrial, social, and religious life. Of necessity there is much duplication of effort and much confusion of endeavor.

Similarly in education, the constantly growing demand for better citizenship training has resulted in a great diversity of uncoordinated practices, each emphasizing important features of good citizenship, thereby contributing both to progress and to confusion of mind as to what the ideals and objectives of citizenship training are.

It is believed that the experience of the Federal Council is significant in all fields in which numerous agencies are trying without coordinating effort to accomplish rather vaguely defined objectives. From the foregoing it is clear that the importance of the council's work to date has not been in the production of the chart of Federal activities or in the publishing of the community score card. It consists rather in the development of the process of coordinating numerous activities in a given field on the basis of fundamental principles and standard procedure instead of on the basis of administrative and executive action.

Because of the effect of this method in its own field its careful consideration is recommended by the council to all social and welfare organizations that are seeking to coordinate their efforts in the achievement of common objectives like Americanization, curing illiteracy, better citizenship, or even getting out the vote. By way of concrete suggestion to others who may be wrestling with this problem the essential elements in the procedure are here repeated. They are:

1. Make a chart showing: (a) The activities of all agencies in the field; (b) the specific work each is doing; and (c) the groups of people reached by each.

2. By means of a score card or other objective method evaluate the present condition of the community as regards education, health, industry, voting, recreation, religion, and other fundamental factors of community life. If the facts thus collected are quantitative and objective, the action needed for improvement will be apparent.

3. By every available means—church, school, playground, club, industry, business, government, personal example—lead every citizen to comprehend and do his bit to realize both in his daily relations with his fellow men and in community life the national ideals expressed in the Preamble to the Constitution.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF STATE ACTIONS ON COOPERATION IN THE USE OF THE COMMUNITY SCORE CARD¹

ALABAMA.

Gov. William W. Brandon referred correspondence to Col. Hartley A. Moon, the adjutant general of Alabama, who advised that the council take up the matter with Miss Mary Woodruff, Montgomery, director of the school and community betterment. Miss Woodruff requested 700 copies of the score card on February 19 to be sent to betterment associations and supervisors.

ARIZONA.

Gov. George W. P. Hunt replied to the President's letter and also letter from Federal Council. In letter of April 9, he states:

The citizenship training matter you sent has been referred to a committee of experts making an educational survey in the State of Arizona who are preparing data for reorganization of our educational system.

ARKANSAS.

Gov. Thomas C. McRae advises in letter of April 11:

This plan is entirely too comprehensive and too full of detail to be assumed by an executive whose burdens are already heavy.

CALIFORNIA.

Gov. F. W. Richardson acknowledged the letter from the President, on November 5, 1923.

COLORADO.

Gov. William E. Sweet acknowledged letter from the President on November 8, 1923. He expressed desire to cooperate. He also acknowledged letter from the Federal Council on January 30, but suggested no plan for cooperation.

CONNECTICUT.

Gov. Charles A. Templeton acknowledged letter from the President on November 14, 1923, stating that he "can not see his way clear to cooperate."

¹ States omitted have not yet replied.

DELAWARE.

Gov. W. D. Denney acknowledged the President's letter. Also replied to letter from Federal Council on January 25, advising that Dr. R. W. Cooper, care of Service Citizens, Wilmington, would cooperate.

FLORIDA.

Gov. Cary A. Hardee's Secretary acknowledged letter from Federal Council on January 28, advising that the governor is out of the city but would reply later.

GEORGIA.

Gov. Clifford Walker acknowledged the President's letter on November 7 expressing appreciation of the work.

IDAHO.

Gov. Charles C. Moore did not acknowledge the President's letter. His secretary acknowledged the letter from the Federal Council on January 29 stating that the governor was ill, but a list of the names of the cooperating committee would be sent in shortly.

INDIANA.

Gov. Warren T. McCray acknowledged the President's letter on November 5. Willing to cooperate.

IOWA.

Gov. N. E. Kendall acknowledged letter from the President on November 5. Expressed willingness to cooperate. Another letter to the President on December 21 named the following committee: May E. Francis, Des Moines; R. H. Burton-Smith, Sioux City; Mrs. Ellsworth Richardson, Pella; Mrs. Harry M. Harris, Des Moines; Pres. R. A. Pearson, Ames. Correspondence from Mrs. Harris and President Pearson shows active distribution of the score card.

LOUISIANA.

Gov. John M. Parker replied to letter from the Federal Council on January 28 giving the names of the cooperating committee as follows: Hon. T. H. Harris, superintendent of education, Baton Rouge; Hon. John McW. Ford, Shreveport; Mrs. Joseph E. Friend, New Orleans, president Women's Clubs; Mrs. A. G. Reed, Baton Rouge.

MAINE.

Gov. Percival D. Baxter replied to the President's letter on November 1, 1923, expressing appreciation of the work. Also replied to letter from the Federal Council on April 7, stating: "We do not at the present time have the machinery to carry into effect your suggestions."

MARYLAND.

Gov. Albert C. Ritchie replied to the President's letter on October 30, 1923. Desires to cooperate.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Gov. Channing H. Cox acknowledged letter from the President and also from the Federal Council. Letter from Hon. Payson Smith, commissioner of education, states that the governor has turned over the matter to his office.

MINNESOTA.

Gov. J. A. O. Preus, in his reply to the letter from the Federal Council on January 21, gave the name of Mrs. E. G. Quamme, president State League of Parent-Teachers' Association, 1556 Fairmont, Avenue, St. Paul.

MISSOURI.

Gov. Arthur M. Hyde acknowledged letter from the President on November 3 requesting 100 copies of community score card, which the council sent him.

NEBRASKA.

Gov. Charles W. Bryan's secretary acknowledged letter from the Federal Council on February 8.

NEVADA.

Gov. J. J. Scrugham acknowledged the letter from the President and expressed his desire to cooperate. He also replied to letter from the Federal Council on April 12 advising that the correspondence has been referred to Hon. W. J. Hunting, State superintendent of public instruction.

NEW JERSEY.

Gov. George Silzer acknowledged the letter from the President on November 7, advising that he would at once take the matter up with those who would likely be of assistance in the matter. Another letter to the President on December 6 advised:

I have had an investigation made, which has delayed my reply, and the general opinion of those in charge of the educational work of the State is that there is now being accomplished at this time in the State a purpose similar to the one in the community score card.

NEW YORK.

Gov. Alfred E. Smith, in reply to the letter from the President, named Hon. Frank P. Graves, commissioner of education, and Dr. Matthias N. Nicoll, State commissioner of health, to act as a committee to cooperate with the Federal Council. Commissioner Graves requested 400 copies of the score card to be distributed among village and rural superintendents of schools.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Governor R. A. Nestos in reply to the letter from the President appointed the following as a committee to cooperate: President Thomas F. Kane, University; President George A. McFarland, Minot; Miss Minnie J. Nielson, Bismarck; Dr. A. A. Whittemore, Bismarck; Mrs. L. N. Cary, Mandan; Maj. George H. Russ, Bismarck; and John Knauf, Jamestown.

OHIO.

Gov. A. V. Donahey acknowledged letter from the President and referred the matter to W. B. Bliss, assistant director of the department of education. Director Bliss advises that "publicity of this project has been given in The Better Schools Bulletin. * * * We have not appointed any State committee but are encouraging local communities to take the matter up through such publicity as the above article reveals." Mrs. Emily G. Muldoon, chairman of committee on education, Federation of Women's Clubs, Youngstown, has taken an active interest in the score-card distribution. The council has sent her 30 copies. Also, J. L. McLeish, director of the Americanization executive committee, has submitted to the Federal Council answers to questions on page 25 of the score card.

OREGON.

Gov. Walter M. Pierce in his reply to the letter from the Federal Council of March 13, named Dean F. G. Young, of the school of sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., to cooperate with the council. On March 26, Dean Young submitted copy of circular letter sent to each school principal. He also requested 100 copies of the community score card.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Gov. Gifford Pinchot in his reply to the letter from the President suggested changes in the score card. These were made in the new score card. On January 29 the governor replied giving his approval of the changes and stated that he would advise later as to the methods used in that State. On April 14 he advised that "our plans are not as yet fully developed nor are our cooperative committees formed." On April 16 Ellen C. Potter, secretary of welfare of the department of welfare, Harrisburg, advised that "the governor is taking steps to appoint the State committee to further this project."

RHODE ISLAND.

Gov. William S. Flynn in his reply to the letter from the President advised "after considering this matter at great length I have referred the same to the State board of education for their investigation and advice as to the most efficient method of using it in this State."

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Gov. Thomas G. McLeod replied to the letter from the President expressing his desire to cooperate. On April 18 he acknowledged letter from the Federal Council but stated "no committees have been appointed."

TENNESSEE.

Gov. Austin Peay referred the letter from the President to Hon. P. L. Harned, commissioner of education. Commissioner Harned advised on April 9 that-

I am taking this matter up with the president of the Tennessee Federation of Parent-Teacher Associations and together we shall try to work out some plan by which we may interest communities in this State in using the score card.

TEXAS.

Gov. Pat M. Neff replied to the letter from the President on November 2, 1923, expressing his desire to cooperate. On March 11, he advised the Federal Council that he had appointed the following to cooperate: Mrs. J. U. Fields, Haskell; Mrs. W. B. Toome, Lampasas; Gen. J. F. Wolters, Houston; Dr. E. D. Shurter, Southern University, Dallas; and Mrs. P. V. Pennybaker, chairman of department of American citizenship, Austin. Mrs. Pennybaker referred the work to Mrs. William R. Alvord, chairman of citizenship training.

UTAH.

Gov. Charles R. Mabey replied to the letter from the President on November 5, 1923, expressing his desire to cooperate. In reply to the letter from the Federal Council on January 29, he advised that no State committee had been appointed but that he had referred the matter to the State adjutant general for action.

VERMONT.

Gov. Redfield Proctor, in his reply to the letter from the President on November 26, submitted the names of those appointed to serve on the State committee: Hon. Mason S. Stone, Montpelier; Hon. Clarence H. Dempsey, Montpelier; President Guy W. Bailey, Burlington; President Paul D. Moody, Middlebury; President Chas. A. Plumley, Northfield; Miss Caroline S. Woodruff, Castleton; Mrs. T. M. Slack, Springfield; and Mrs. Edith M. Stuart, Lyndonville. The Federal Council sent 25 copies of the score card to Hon. Mason S. Stone, who replied from South America that he would take the matter up on his return to the United States.

WASHINGTON.

Gov. Louis F. Hart replied to the letter from the President expressing desire to cooperate as far as possible.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Gov. E. F. Morgan replied to the letter from the President expressing his desire to cooperate. In his reply to the letter from the Federal Council of January 28, he named Hon. George M. Ford, State superintendent of schools, Charleston. The Federal Council took the matter up with Hon. George M. Ford and Mr. Nat. T. Frame, director of agricultural extension, of Morgantown University. These have agreed to score 10 communities and compare results with those from their own score card.

WISCONSIN.

Gov. John J. Blaine, in reply to letter from the Federal Council on April 11, advised that the work was referred to Hon. John Callahan, superintendent of public instruction at Madison. Mr. Callahan advised in letter of April 22 that a committee of prominent citizens of the State had organized a better-cities contest, and that the community score card was being used at least in part by this committee.

WYOMING.

Gov. William B. Ross acknowledged letter from the President, and named Dr. G. M. Anderson, State health officer, as one who could cooperate in this work.

○

23274

**END OF
TITLE**